

BW339

V4

Tewers' Reply to Dr Campbell

1847

BW339

NA

**Wesley Memorial Library**

**Thursfield Smith Collection**

of

**Wesleyana**



**Atlanta,**

-

**Georgia**

Wes. 1372

# WESLEYAN METHODISM VINDICATED,

AND

## THE "CHRISTIAN WITNESS" REFUTED:

A REPLY TO THE ATTACKS MADE UPON WESLEYAN METHODISM  
AND ITS MINISTERS IN THAT PUBLICATION,

IN TWO LETTERS, ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR,

THE REV. J. CAMPBELL, D.D.:

WITH INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

---

BY THE REV. WILLIAM VEVERS.

---

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

A "FALSE WITNESS" FURTHER "UNMASKED."

BY THE REV. JOHN S. STAMP.

---

"PROVE ALL THINGS: HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."—ST. PAUL.

---

THIRD EDITION.

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY JOHN MASON, 14, CITY-ROAD;  
SOLD AT 66, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

1847.

BW339

V4.

# WESLEYAN METHODISM VINDICATED.

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

It is not from pleasure in controversy, but from the love of truth, that the present writer submits to the candid consideration of the religious public, and especially to the readers of the "Christian Witness," but more particularly to those Ministers of the Gospel, who, being members of the CONGREGATIONAL UNION of England and Wales, and also of the EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE, are deeply involved in the character of their "OFFICIAL ORGAN," the following observations, on the wanton, unprovoked, and gratuitous attack, which was made upon Methodism and its Ministers in the "Christian Witness," for January last; and which has been continued in the succeeding Numbers, with a bitterness amounting almost to malignity, and a personality approaching the scurrilous.

That this indication of the character of the attack which has been made upon the Wesleyan Ministers, is not an assumption, will be apparent to any candid person, who will impartially consider the following language employed by Dr. Campbell, and applied by him, not to the "system" of Methodism, but to its "Ministers;" and that too in the very page (January, p. 28) where he says, "We speak not of the men, but of the system;" but after having given utterance to a few sentences, in the tone and temper of an oracle, he says, "Let these things be done, and then men will no more have to say, Thou art the land that is not *cleansed* nor *rained upon* in the day of indignation! There is a conspiracy of her prophets in the midst thereof, like a roaring lion ravening the prey; they have devoured souls; they have taken the treasure and precious things. Her priests have VIOLATED MY LAW, AND HAVE PROFANED MINE HOLY THINGS: THEY HAVE PUT NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE HOLY AND PROFANE; neither have they showed DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE UNCLEAN AND THE CLEAN." (Ezekiel xxii. 24—26.) ("Christian Witness," Jan., p. 28.) The italics, and capitals, in which this passage appears, are marked by Dr. Campbell himself! What becomes of his declaration, "We speak not of the men, but of the system!" He either *did*, or *did not*, apply the language of Ezekiel to the system! Can any man possessing an ordinary understanding, suppose that such language is designedly applied to the system of Methodism? If not applied to the system, then it is applied to the Ministers of Methodism! What becomes, I repeat, of the declaration, "We speak not of the *men*, but of the *system*!" What did the Editor mean when he said, "The Methodist Conference is composed of *wise* and *just* men!" (Page 25.) Can men be "*wise*" and "*just*," who have "devoured souls;" "taken the treasure and precious things;" "violated the law, profaned the holy things, put no difference between the holy and the profane, showed no difference between the unclean and the clean." To apply this language to the system is preposterous! to the Ministers, is arrogance! The praise of such a writer is worthless! his censure is calumny!

On reading the article on "Wesleyan Methodism," in the "Witness," for January, it was easy to discover the *animus* and object of the writers; (I say *writers*, for in addition to the Editorial remarks, he has admitted those of anonymous writers, whose productions he applauds, and by their publication makes them his own;) the spirit was uncharitable, the object was mischievous; and subscribing, as I do, to the sentiment of an eminent writer, "It is almost

Wes. 1372

as criminal to hear a worthy man traduced without attempting his justification, as to be the author of the calumny against him; it is, in fact, a sort of misprision of treason against society," I was led, in vindication of those honoured men, with whom I have been associated in the work of the ministry for upwards of thirty-three years, to send a letter, which appeared in the "Witness," for March, and which is now re-printed; but as the criminator's article in the "Witness," for January, contained such a number of charges, many of which I *know to be false*, and others very fallacious, I thought it a duty to myself, and my calumniated brethren, to forward a *second* letter for insertion in the "Witness," for May, which, however, was instantly returned, accompanied with the following note, which I copy *verbatim*, as a specimen of the impartiality of the Editor of the "Christian Witness:"—

"London, April 9th, 1847.

"SIR,

"I HAVE just received your letter, and, on looking over it, find it is unnecessarily and unreasonably long. It must be abridged, at least one half; and divested of those flings at the 'Witness,' and personalities towards its Editor, to which no man in a sound mind ought to expect me to give circulation. There were none of these in the Editorial Article, and it is necessary that you observe the same rules of decency. I shall endeavour to arrange matters so that, if you return it by next Tuesday morning, it will be inserted; but if you can remit it by Monday morning it will be a great convenience. If re-copied, please have it legibly written, to prevent the printers, as is their custom, charging extra for 'bad copy;' as well as to prevent mistakes, which may otherwise occur.

"Yours truly,

"JOHN CAMPBELL."

"Rev. W. Vevers, Hull."

On the receipt of this letter, I perceived that if I either *abridged* my letter to the "Witness," or *expunged* any paragraph or sentence, I should be entirely at the mercy of the Editor; who, having required me to "abridge it at least one-half," "divest it of the flings at the Witness, and personalities towards its Editor," there being "none of these in the editorial article!" and that it was necessary for me "to observe the same rules of decency!" I wrote to the Editor, stating, that "if I am to understand that the only condition on which it (my letter) can be inserted is that which you state, I at once withdraw it: I will not *abridge* or *expunge* anything, as I regard the whole as necessary to answer the attack you have made on the Wesleyans. I decline any further communication with the 'Witness;' but shall take care that my letter, in its *present* form, shall appear, through some other channel, and leave the religious public to judge between us." It is in the fulfilment of my purpose, as stated to Dr. Campbell, that I now submit my *second*, and rejected, letter to the candid consideration of those who may think proper to read it. But as it will now appear in a separate form, it has been thought desirable to republish the letter which *did appear* in the "Witness," with the third paragraph of which the exquisitely sensitive and fastidious Editor was so shocked, that he regarded it as a special evidence of Christian liberality to allow its publication in that dignified periodical! "We might justly here close our columns to any further communication of our correspondent, especially after the uncalled for and unjustifiable language of the third paragraph of his letter." (Christian Witness, p. 117.) Doubtless the reader, who has not seen the paragraph to which this specimen of literary prudery refers, will be prepared to discover something quite shocking and perfectly indecent! He will find the obnoxious paragraph in the first letter, as herewith published; and I leave him to judge, if that excited so much feeling in the bosom of the pugnacious Editor, in what a position I should have placed myself by abridging and expunging any sentence in my second epistle; and how he would have taunted me with the expurgations my letter had undergone, before he deemed it fit to meet the public eye! and thus my friends might have felt some cause for shame, and others would have been

quite outrageous in their triumph, on the supposition that my communication was so full of "flings," "personalities," and "indecencies," as to be utterly unfit for publication, having excited the disapprobation of the fastidious Editor of the "Christian Witness!" By its publication the reader will be able to form his own judgment, which, I doubt not, will be according to truth.

Though I am anxious not to extend the limits I had previously prescribed for myself, yet, as I intend this to be my final communication in relation to the "Christian Witness," I think it proper to advert to the new matter which is introduced in the *May* Number, the cover of which contains an address to the Wesleyan Methodists, in which the writer assumes the fact of having been once a Wesleyan, as "favourable to the discovery of the worth of the people, and the viciousness of the government," which "ought to add force to his argumentation." The import of this language is too obvious to be doubted! The writer plainly avers, that, as "Luther, Calvin, and Knox," though "cradled in Popery," emancipated themselves, which was as much "for the world's highest welfare" as for "their own eternal honour;" so he, being "cradled in Methodism, outgrew the dimensions of the 'cradle,' sprung forth from his confinement, and has ever since walked at liberty." What are the facts connected with his having been "cradled in Methodism?" and how long was the period when he wore the "swaddling bands?"

The following are the facts of this case of "cradling" and "swaddling:"—In the year 1820 I was appointed, by the Methodist Conference, as a Minister in the city of Glasgow, in Scotland, where I continued till 1823. During that period the late Rev. Thomas Mollard was stationed at Dundee. It was, I believe, under the ministry of Mr. Mollard, at Dundee, that Mr. Campbell was led to leave the church with which he was connected, and unite with the Wesleyans, and he very soon became a candidate for our ministry, as a Local Preacher. He removed from Dundee to Glasgow, and was introduced by Mr. Mollard to Mr. Ward, as a Local Preacher recently *received on trial*; and I distinctly recollect, in company with Mr. Ward, hearing him preach trial-sermons, in the Calton and Tradeston chapels, Glasgow. At that period he betrayed all the ardour of a new convert to Methodism; and though he did not actually apply "for admission to our Itinerant ministry," yet it was sufficiently perceptible, from his *avowals of preference to our body*, that if Mr. Ward had countenanced him, and the door had been open, he would have entered in and become a Minister among the Wesleyans. After I left Glasgow, and returned to England, I heard that Mr. Campbell had retired from the Wesleyans, and united with some other body. In stating these facts I have no design to upbraid the individual to whom they refer. I honour the man who from principle retires peaceably from a religious community, on a conscientious difference of opinion, either on matters of doctrine or modes of church-government. But when such an individual comes forward, at a "period nearly a generation" after the event, and somewhat ostentatiously boasts that he "rapidly outgrew the dimensions of the 'cradle,'" and "sprung forth from his confinement;" and avows that this season of "cradling" and "swaddling" was "favourable to the discovery of the worth of the people, and the viciousness of the government;" the case assumes a very different aspect, and without any disrespect to the individual, it is quite in harmony with truth to affirm, that if he possess no other knowledge of the "worth of the people" and of "the viciousness of the government" than that which he acquired in the "cradle" in Dundee and Glasgow, his knowledge scarcely comprehends the elementary principles of Methodism; and though he thinks that "for the time he ought to be a teacher," he "has need that one teach him again which be the first principles" of Wesleyan doctrine and polity! The "cradle" is not the place either to acquire or exhibit knowledge. To such writers I would say, Study Methodism in its doctrines, its polity, and its moral and religious influence upon society, both at home and abroad, before you attempt, either under the pretext of "friendly strictures" or of palpable vituperation, to denounce a system you do not understand; or to malign a body of Ministers who, in their love of liberty, and hatred of oppression, and laborious efforts to promote

the honour of God and the happiness of man, are, at least, equal to those who speak evil of them, as of "evil doers," and who "falsely accuse their good conversation in Christ." (1 Peter iii. 16.)

I cannot conclude these introductory remarks without adverting to a letter from Derby, inserted in the "Witness," for May, relating to money borrowed upon Wesleyan chapels; and which the Editor adduces as a strong case of hardship, which illustrates the peculiar workings of the despotism in a given direction. The party states, "that some years ago he lent a sum of money to the Trustees of a Wesleyan chapel; that he did not obtain either principal or interest; that he is now precluded the recovery of his just demands, by being 'barred by the Statute of Limitation!'" This is a plausible statement, calculated to make an impression on the reader, much, very much, to the dishonour of Methodism. If the facts be truly and fully stated, I have no hesitation in saying, that such a *fraudulent act* is highly disgraceful to the parties implicated, and deserves the most marked and explicit reprobation. So far as my knowledge extends, this case is quite *unique*: I never heard the "Statute of Limitations" adduced in connexion with Methodist trust-property as a reason for the refusal to pay an acknowledged just debt: and should such a body of Trustees be in existence, they deserve to be exposed as unprincipled men; and if they are not ashamed of Methodism, the Methodists ought to be ashamed of them! But is the whole truth stated in this case? I believe not! The writer does not say that the Trustees *plead* the "Statute of Limitations" for the non-payment of his just demand! This is an inference of his own; but so interwoven in the statement, as to convey to the cursory reader, that it is the plea of the Trustees! Is this a fair statement, for the simple object of conveying the truth, and nothing but the truth? The writer states, that when I resided in Derby I called upon him, and took a copy of the promissory note which he held from the Trustees. I recollect calling upon him, and that on the first statement of his case, I was startled with its character; but my present impression is (I speak from memory) that his brother-in-law, now deceased, had claimed the right to dispose of that property; and that the matter at issue was between him and his brother-in-law, partaking of a family dispute respecting the disposal of paternal property, and not with the Trustees. I will not vouch for the entire accuracy of this statement; but I make it in *perfect sincerity*, dependent upon memory, having had no reason since the interview to recall the case to my recollection. Of this, however, I am certain, that unless there had been some other reason, and not the "Statute of Limitations," (a feature now, I believe, brought out for the first time, just to render the case more hideous; and to make the imputed "despotism" of the Wesleyans stand out more prominently!) the matter would long since have been settled, if not on the principles of Christian honesty, yet by the authority of British law! I have no hesitation in saying, if the facts of the case be correctly stated, "Were I you, I would push it!" Most certainly I would! Neither the apprehended refusal of the Trustees, nor that frightful bugbear—"the tyranny of the Conference"—should deter me from making a claim upon the Trustees, not on the Conference, for that debt which would, if just, be obtained! The man is scarcely entitled to sympathy who, having such a case, allows it to linger until "barred by the Statute of Limitations," and then seeks consolation by a public proclamation of his folly, though with an evident and avowed design to hold up Methodism to the scorn and indignant contempt of mankind!

Before I dismiss this case, the colouring of which is so deeply shaded by the "Statute of Limitations!" I would put it to the candid, not to say Christian, judgment of any impartial man,—even to the conscience of the Editor of the "Witness" himself,—was it in accordance with the principles of British justice, or in harmony with the precepts of Divine authority, to print and publish such a statement without a knowledge of its truth? or without giving the accused party an opportunity of making a counter-statement? If this be the principle by which the "Witness" regulates the insertion of accusatory statements in its pages, it ceases to be a "Christian" Witness! It will in fact soon become

a mere heap of mud, in which scavengers of all degrees and denominations will deposit the mire and filth which they collect; and then it will be impossible to distinguish the "difference between the clean and the unclean!"

There are other topics which might be profitably discussed in connexion with Methodism; but having already exceeded my intended limits, I must commit these introductory remarks to the candid judgment of the reader. My object is not of an aggressive, but defensive character; and I cannot but place on record my deep regret, that, at this period so full of promise, grounded on the buds and blossoms which have recently been exhibited in those indications of brotherly love, and "Christian Alliance," and which promised a superabundance of those things which are "pure, and lovely, and of good report," combined with public events, so ominous and admonitory to all Protestants,—the peace should be broken, the strength weakened, and the success of our common Christianity retarded, by obstructions and aspersions which originate with a professedly "Christian Witness!"

## PART I.

THE following article appeared in the "Christian Witness," of March, 1847, which we take the liberty of now laying before our readers, with the prefatory remarks of the Editor, the Rev. John Campbell:—

"IT has, our readers are aware, been from the first our practice, from year to year, to cast our eyes abroad on all sections of the gospel vineyard, that we might report progress concerning the work of God, always noting with care whatever was excellent, and holding it up for imitation, and, when circumstances required it, frankly animadverting on matters of an opposite character. With these views, and with the best feelings, we lately brought forward the subject of Methodism, never for a moment supposing our friendly strictures would be considered 'an attack,' or call forth, from any quarter, aught in the shape of defence or vindication. But the following letter of the Rev. William Vevers, Chairman of the Hull District, shows we were mistaken:—"

*To the Editor of the Christian Witness.*

SIR,

THE observations you have made on Wesleyan Methodism are of such a character as to demand a prompt and explicit reply; and I confide in your impartiality, as the Editor of a religious publication, for the insertion, in your next Number, of the present communication, which is avowedly in vindication of Methodism, that the antidote may be co-extensive with the crimation.

Your observations, and those of your anonymous correspondents, (not the most honourable and manly correspondents,) supply ample materials for a protracted reply; but, as "the reason of things is found in few words," I shall study brevity.

I offer no remarks on your statistical statements. These are matters of minor importance, when compared with the fundamental principles involved in this discussion. Methodism either is or is not the system which you and your correspondents describe it to be. If your and their representation of Methodism be a character, and not a caricature, then I admit with all possible sincerity that the sooner it is demolished, and the memorials of its existence scattered like chaff before the whirlwind, the better: but if it be a caricature, and not a character, as I AFFIRM IT IS, then you are bound by every principle of justice to admit into your pages vindicatory communications; and if you refuse, you will inevitably expose yourself, and I think deservedly so, not merely to the distrust, but to the reproach, of mankind. As a Wesleyan Minister, who feels himself and his brethren grossly maligned by the article in



question, I join issue with you and your correspondents, and shall proceed, without any further introductory remarks, to point out the fallacy and the falsehood of many of the "findings" of your correspondent "Aleph."

Several of the "findings" of Aleph are mere truisms, obviously introduced to swell the number of accusatory articles; but as they do not affect the matter at issue, they may for the present pass without observation: and therefore I shall select those which are the most prominent, and the tendency of which is to place Methodism in the most offensive and objectionable light.

I. Aleph "finds" "that these gentlemen (the Wesleyan Ministers) have power to occupy all the chapels when, by whom, and how they think proper." This is true in fact, but false in the popular construction of the statement; as its obvious design is, to convey an idea of irresponsible and tyrannical power possessed by the Conference. But what is the simple fact of the case? The Conference have the power, and the only power, to appoint Ministers to occupy the pulpits; but it is only such persons as are recognised by the "deed of settlement" of each chapel, and only while such Ministers preach the doctrines taught by the late Rev. John Wesley in his four volumes of sermons. Such, and such only, can be appointed by the Conference. I hold that this is one of the most equitable and scriptural arrangements that the ingenuity of man could have devised, constituting the proper balance of power, because it places limits to the power of the Conference, and also to that of the Trustees. Your own experience in Chancery-proceedings with the Trustees of the Tabernacle,—the legal and apparently interminable proceedings of the Non-conformists in the case of Lady Hewley's Charity,—the perversion of the pulpits formerly occupied by the old orthodox Presbyterians, but now possessed by the Socinians,—are sufficient examples of the importance and necessity of such a definite and equitable settlement. The Conference have the power to appoint Ministers to occupy the pulpits according to the terms of the deeds; the Trustees have the entire management of all pecuniary matters, with power to eject a Minister from the pulpit, though even appointed by the Conference, if he should not be such an one as the deed recognises. Can anything be more equitable? The power of appointment must be lodged somewhere; and there ought to be the power to remove, should any objectionable change take place after the appointment. I know of no religious system in Christendom in which the Trustees have the power which they possess in the system of Methodism. How much of local discord would be prevented if the Trustees of Nonconformist churches had the same degree of power! The Trustees have not the power to appropriate the chapels to their own use; they are not proprietors, but Trustees, whose rights are legally defined, and of which no effort has ever been, and, I believe, never will be, made by the Methodist Conference to deprive them. This wise and prudential arrangement is the great sheet-anchor of Methodism; and I have a deep conviction that the more rigidly and candidly it is examined, the more it will commend itself to reasonable and candid men. It preserves the balance of power, so that the Conference cannot—I say CANNOT—tyrannize over the Trustees; nor can the Trustees trample upon the rights and privileges either of the Ministers or the people. In reference to such an arrangement I would, with all possible sincerity, in a spirit of piety and patriotism, with an ardent love of liberty, and an unconquerable hatred of slavery, say, "ESTO PERPETUA!"

II. Aleph finds "that they can authorize what measures, erections, and collections they deem wise and necessary." This is false. 1. No chapel can be erected without the previous consent of the Chapel-Building Committee, consisting of *laymen* and Ministers. 2. The appropriation of collections made for embarrassed chapels is the act of a Committee of laymen and Ministers. 3. The application of *all* collections is made by laymen and Ministers, generally of an equal number.

III. Aleph finds "that they have power to admit, suspend, expel, appoint, or re-appoint Ministers, and power to receive and expel members, in opposition to local authorities, if they think proper so to do." This comprehends some portions of truth, but with a large amount of falsehood; and the whole sentence

is so constructed as to convey impressions the very opposite to the truth. 1. They have power to admit candidates to the ministry; but such candidates must have been previously nominated, without being objected to, in the March Quarterly Meeting, where laymen greatly preponderate in number. This is the first step taken in reference to a candidate for the Wesleyan ministry. Is there any similar arrangement by which laymen can check or prevent the introduction of improper persons to the ministry either in the Established or Nonconformist churches? I know of none; but I shall be thankful either for correction or information. 2. They do suspend or expel from ministerial communion; but these acts are regulated by known and fixed rules and principles, not by mere whim and caprice; and to these rules all, without exception, are subject. This mutual submission to law is essential to the good government of well-regulated communities, whether civil or religious. Liberty without law would be licentiousness. 3. They do appoint and re-appoint, but these arrangements are in harmony with the wishes of the people in the great majority of the cases. This is the general rule, but there may be exceptions. These appointments being yearly ones, and at the longest for two years, unless there be a special invitation for a third year,—a period beyond which the Conference cannot appoint the most influential Minister in the body to any chapel in the Wesleyan Connexion,—there can be no tyranny, nor any approach to it, in any such Conference acts. But “they receive and expel members in opposition to local authorities.” This is false. The reception and expulsion of members are regulated by fixed rules, than which nothing can be more reasonable and scriptural. What right have local authorities to contravene general and fixed rules? They are not Independent, but Connexional authorities. While they enjoy the privileges, surely they ought not to object to the rules and principles, of the Connexion. That there is a material difference between Independent and Connexional principles of church government, we admit; but surely an Independent cannot object to a fellow-subject giving a preference to the Connexional principles. If he do, what becomes of Independency? Is it not much preferable to be regulated by fixed and published rules, than to be left to the whim or caprice of individual men? During the thirty-three years I have been in the ministry, I have never known a case of expulsion that was tyrannical. It might at any time be said it was tyrannical, but that does not make it so.

IV. Aleph finds “that they nominate to all offices.” Certainly they do; but is that tyrannical? They nominate, but they do not elect. The election is with the members of the meeting. To allow them neither to nominate nor elect would be to prostrate the ministerial office to the dust. What endless confusion would result from a nomination by a multitude, each of which might propose his favourite man! Have you no choice in the election of Deacons and other church-officers at the Tabernacle?

V. Aleph finds “that they manage all the committees and institutions.” What a body of clever men the Ministers must be to be able to manage everything and every man. This is too high a compliment, which we really do not merit. I shall not insult the *lay* members of our various committees by defending them from such imputations of pusillanimity. I bear them record that for general intelligence, Christian liberality, individual piety, and personal independence, they are, at least, equal to any similar number of Christian gentlemen holding office in any of the churches of Christendom.

VI. Aleph finds “that they have the appropriation of nearly all the funds.” *This is false.* There is not a fund in Methodism, with the exception of the Ministers’ Annuitant Society, and which is formed by *their own subscriptions* of £6 per annum, but what is placed under the management of laymen and Ministers; and from the decision of each mixed committee there is no appeal, not even to the Conference. The committees report, but they do not appeal to the Conference. What an amount of power—tyrannical power—we exercise in receiving, without being able to alter any report! This is tyranny with a witness! What lover of power does not envy the men who have the power

to receive information on any subject, without being able to make the least alteration?

VII. Aleph finds "that the Trustees cannot sell property, however necessary, without their sanction." Certainly not. It would be a violation of every principle of law and equity if they had this power. Trustees, you know as well as I do, Dr. Campbell, are not proprietors, but simply Trustees, whose duties are defined, and who are responsible to the parties for whose benefit they act. Does Aleph know the difference between trusteeship and ownership? If he does, it was disingenuous to write as he has done: if he does not, he ought to be instructed in the first principles of law and equity. An ignorant or a disingenuous man would make sad havoc with any system which he might undertake to reform. It would be better to demolish it at once than entrust it to such a reformer.

VIII. Aleph finds "that no meeting can be called, letters written, nothing done or attempted, without leave first duly had and obtained of the Conference." What a monstrous combination of men this Conference must be! How comes it to pass that they have not long since been compelled to expatriate themselves, and try some experiments with the Dey of Algiers? But what are the facts of this case? may I not say, this very horrible case? Why, this is simply a prudential regulation, to prevent continual turmoil and confusion. There are, as you are well aware, in every community, men with whom wisdom will die,—who are everything by turns and nothing long,—who resemble the grasshoppers mentioned by Burke, who make the field ring with their impertinent clatter, and imagine that they are the only occupants; while, at the same time, there are numbers as wise, as prudent, as pious, and as independent, who silently and gratefully enjoy their privileges, who "lie down in green pastures, and are led beside the still waters."

These are the chief "findings" of Aleph as exhibited in his *first* category. I think the Wesleyans may, as I am sure Methodism will, survive this caricature by Aleph. I should have been disposed to laugh at it, if I had not met it in such a publication as "The Christian Witness." I suppose you know the writer; otherwise I should have thought it was a mere hoax; and that the writer was endeavouring to ascertain to what degree of assumption he might proceed without detection and exposure. But you give importance to this extraordinary exhibition of fallacy and falsehood. "This may safely be pronounced a document of great moment." Certainly it is one of great moment. It shows that the race is not extinct of those of whom Locke says, "They know a little, presume a great deal, and so jump to a conclusion." But you proceed and say, "The well-considered opinions of a writer so observant and so penetrating as Aleph, deserve attention not only from the body to which he belongs, but from every section of the Christian church. If he is right, the present condition of Methodism," &c. Why put the case hypothetically? His statements are either true or false. That they are *not* true, I confidently affirm. I can perceive no evidence either of observation or penetration; and therefore they do not deserve your commendation, or the attention of your readers.

There are other matters in the article which I think it due to you and to your readers to expose; but they must be delayed for another communication. I depend upon your Christian candour for the insertion of this letter in "The Christian Witness." I think it respectful to you and to the public, that this vindication of Methodism should not be anonymous, and therefore I subscribe myself,

Yours, very faithfully,

W. VEVERS.

Hull, January 16, 1847.

"VINDICATE SLANDERED WORTH."—*Dr. Campbell.* "Christian Witness."

*Hull, April 6th, 1847.*

REVEREND SIR,

THOUGH your articles on Methodism supply ample materials for a protracted controversy, yet as *that* is what you "deprecate," as you prefer "statement to disputation," I will endeavour, with all possible brevity, to notice the matters which are still at issue between us, selecting the most prominent, and most important.

It appears that my letter "is occupied with very secondary matters, and leaves every one of the strong points untouched." Secondary matters! *Aleph* did not think them secondary matters; *you* did not think them secondary matters! The matters which have been already discussed, are among the *primary* and *fundamental* principles of Wesleyan polity: and if you regard them as secondary, I am at a loss to know what are primary matters. I shall not, however, pursue this part of the subject, though I am strongly tempted to do it, lest I should exceed those "reasonable limits" which you intimate as necessary to be observed in order to secure the publication of my letter in the "Christian Witness."

The matter to which you appear to attach the greatest importance, is indicated in the following sentence—"Committees," "equal numbers," &c., "go for nothing, since the *appointment of all is virtually with the Preachers, towards whom they operate less as a check than as a shield.*" It is not usual for Committees to appoint themselves: though a number of men, combined or associated for one common purpose, may agree to form themselves into a Committee. The character of a Committee is, in my estimation, of much more importance, either for theoretical, or practical purposes, than the mode of its appointment. That man must be very querulous, who will quarrel with a Committee, merely on account of the manner of its selection. The efficiency of any Committee will depend upon the character of its members, and the competency of those by whom they are selected. Only satisfy me that the persons who select any Committee are *wise* and *just* men, and I shall rejoice to confide in their proceedings. But "the appointment of all is virtually with the Preachers." Well, and what then? Can it be in better hands? The Preachers are *wise* and *just* men! This is not my testimony, but your own. In the "Witness" for January, (page 25,) you say, "*The Methodist Conference is composed of WISE and JUST MEN.*" Can any persons be better qualified to appoint a Committee, than those who are *wise* and *just*? Their *wisdom* will save them from *foolish*, and their *justice* from *unrighteous*, appointments. When there is wisdom and rectitude in those who appoint, there will be competency in those who are appointed a Committee. Grant me the premises, and I have no fear as to the results. Where wisdom and justice are combined, confidence is not merely justified, but demanded: if not, we must be plunged into a labyrinth of uncertainty and miserable distrust.

But the Committee-men who are lay-members "*operate less as a check than as a shield.*" Are *wise* and *just* men to be checked? Do *wise* and *just* men require a shield? What imputations these terms convey, as to the motives and proceedings of the Ministers who you affirm appoint, and the laymen who constitute an equal proportion of the Committees! It is not necessary for me to defend my brethren in the ministry from such dishonourable imputations. I adduce in their favour the testimony of one, to whom the readers of "The Witness" will, doubtless, pay implicit deference; and that is, Dr. Campbell, the Editor, whose explicit testimony is,—"*The Methodist Conference is composed of wise and just men.*" I will not insult the lay-members of the Committees by defending them; but shall reiterate the statement which I made in my former letter,—"*I bear their record that for general intelligence, Christian liberality, individual piety, and personal independence, they are, at least, equal to any similar number of Christian gentlemen holding office in any of the churches of Christendom.*"

But you affirm that "*the appointment of all is virtually with the Preachers.*" This affirmation is either *true* or *false*. You either *did* or *did not* understand the subject on which you wrote. Let your readers judge for themselves. The Committee of *Distribution* of the Fund for the relief of embarrassed CHAPEL TRUSTS, which is appointed to meet in Liverpool, July 23d, 1847, consists of certain official members, of *fifteen* Ministers, and of *fifteen* LAY-TRUSTEES, to be chosen, NOT BY THE PREACHERS, but by the "JUNE QUARTERLY MEETINGS, as follows:—*two* from each of the Liverpool Circuits; *one* from each of the following Circuits, First London, Second London, Manchester First, Manchester Second, Manchester Third, Manchester Fourth, Manchester Fifth, Leeds First, Sheffield West, Chester, Bolton." (Minutes of Conference, 1846, page 119.) The CONTINGENT FUND COMMITTEE, which is appointed to meet in Liverpool, July 22d, 1847, and which has at its disposal the whole amount of the Yearly subscriptions and July collections, to the amount of about TWELVE THOUSAND POUNDS per annum, consists of certain official members, of *fifteen* Ministers, and of *sixteen* gentlemen, members of our Society, to be chosen, NOT BY THE PREACHERS, but by the CIRCUIT STEWARDS, at the next May Meeting of the respective Districts:—viz., "*three* by the Liverpool District; *two* from each of the following Districts,—Manchester and Bolton, Birmingham, Leeds, London; and *one* from each of the following Districts,—Macclesfield, Halifax and Bradford, Shrewsbury, Nottingham and Derby, and Sheffield." (Minutes of Conference, 1846, page 129.) What becomes of the truth of your affirmation, that the appointment of *all* the members of the Committees is virtually with the Preachers? The Quarterly Meetings consist of Ministers, Stewards, Leaders, and Local Preachers. The election for the Contingent Fund is the act of the Circuit Stewards, who are not Preachers, but *laymen*! Is it not desirable—may I not say necessary—for the Editor of a public journal, professedly a *Christian* Witness, to know and understand the religious system which he so unequivocally condemns? "He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him." (Prov. xviii. 17.)

I put it candidly to the sober judgment of every reader of this article,—Is it probable—is it possible—that gentlemen, selected, *not by the Preachers*, but by gentlemen, moving in the same stations of society, having a character to sustain, and holding offices of heavy responsibility, would degrade themselves, and insult their Pastors, by becoming members of any Committee, with the understanding, or the purpose, to act, either as a *check*, or as a *shield*? This imputation cast upon a body of Christian Pastors, and Christian Laymen, holding official stations in the Wesleyan Body, is of such a character as to merit the most unequivocal reprehension. If it had been promulgated in an avowedly infidel publication, it would not have excited any surprise: but to find it in "*The Christian Witness:—the official organ of the Congregational Union of England and Wales,*" is sufficient, not merely to excite surprise, but to produce emotions of a deeper character. Surely the time will come, when Christian men will treat each other with common courtesy, and Christian candour and charity; when "Ephraim shall not envy Judah." (Isa. xi. 13.)

Before I proceed with the other matters at issue, I enter my public and solemn protest, against that system of cowardly and unchristian mode of warfare, which you patronise, by courting and publishing *anonymous* attacks upon Wesleyan Ministers, and their system of ecclesiastical polity. If we must have controversy, which you "*deprecate,*" but which you produce, let us have it in a fair, upright, manly, and Christian manner, carried on by men who are neither ashamed of their principles nor their names; and not by men who attack in masks; and who, to adopt Dr. Johnson's sentiments, display the spirit of cowards; and who, having loaded their muskets to the very muzzle against Methodism and Wesleyan Ministers, have not the courage to draw the trigger. If this mode of warfare, must be encouraged by you as the Editor of a periodical, I beg, for the sake of our common Christianity, that you will expunge the word "*Christian*" from your title-page, and substitute some one more in harmony with its character. As a Christian Minister, I protest against

the desecration of that hallowed title, which ought only to be associated with everything high, and holy, and dignified, and manly; and not prostituted by being found in connexion with proceedings which are as mean as they are unmanly, and as un-English as they are anti-Christian.

In the conclusion of your article in the January Number of "The Witness," you give utterance, in a tone of oracular authority to *three* prescriptions, which you obviously regard as the panacea for all the real and imaginary defects in the system of Wesleyan polity. To each of these prescriptive deliverances I now request the attention of your readers:

1. "*Let the people be emancipated, and invested with all the privileges of the kingdom of God.*" If I clearly understand this oraculous deliverance, I would most sincerely and devoutly say, AMEN. I hate slavery myself in any and every form; and so long as I possess my faculties, I will not be the slave either of systems or of men,—be they Ministers or laymen. The attempts (I suppose in the way of experiments) which have been tried upon myself, but which have invariably failed, have always proceeded from the latter quarter. I believe I am not the only Minister among the Wesleyans, or even the Congregationalists, who can give similar evidence.

"*Let the people be emancipated.*" This is a popular prescription: it is also very profound! Its profundity is such that I cannot fathom it. Emancipate the people! Why do not the people emancipate themselves? Methodism is a voluntary system. Every member becomes, and continues such, in the most free and voluntary manner. There are no pains inflicted, or penalties imposed, on a member who retires from the Wesleyan body. There is no fraud, no deception, used to induce persons to become members. The rules, which regulate the admission and continuance of members, are fixed, printed, published. It is mere nonsense to talk of slavery in connexion with a system of pure voluntarism. What would be the state of any society, either civil or religious, if each individual member, being dissatisfied with the fundamental principles of union, might proceed to agitate the whole body, and keep the members in a state of incessant commotion. Could there be either peace or prosperity under such circumstances? There are restless spirits in every society, who are "everything by turns and nothing long;" whose very element is discord; who are loud in their denunciations of power, as exercised by others; but when invested with authority, they display the very spirit which they have clamorously denounced! Are such persons to be entrusted with the correction of abuses which may actually exist? or do their boisterous complaints necessarily involve the existence of abuses which none can distinguish but themselves? Every man, voluntarily becoming the member of any association, either philosophical or scientific, civil or religious, surrenders some degree of personal power, for which he receives ample compensation by being admitted to the participation of those privileges associated with the society of which he becomes a member. The man that makes his boast that he thinks for himself, ought to remember that others possess, and will exercise, the same power. I have as good a right to talk about tolerating another man, as he has to speak about tolerating me. Am I to become a slave to another, merely that he may not have the pretext of denouncing me as a tyrant. It would be infinitely more honourable, and more in harmony with the spirit of Christianity, if persons who complain of slavery in their union with any section of the church of Christ, would peaceably retire, and unite with others whose principles are more in harmony with their own, than continue in connexion with those whose principles they denounce, and by whose proceedings they profess to be aggrieved. It is a contradiction in terms for persons, who *voluntarily* associate with others, and *willingly* perpetuate that association, to complain of their own slavery, and denounce as tyrants the men whom they have *chosen* as their associates!

The latter part of this prescription bears so close a resemblance to the oracular deliverances of the ancient *Delphic* oracle, that I cannot understand it; nor have I met with a single person that did. What do you mean by the *privileges of the kingdom of God*,—to be invested with which, the people must be

emancipated? I know not of any privileges of a spiritual character, enjoyed by other denominations, that the Wesleyan Ministers withhold from their members. If you possess this knowledge, it will be great kindness to the "slaves" in our body to place them before their view; and then they will be "slaves" indeed, and will not be entitled to your pity if they continue such,—if they do not emancipate themselves!

2. "*Where the sore pressure of poverty requires it, let financial exaction be modified to meet the necessity.*" Financial exaction! What do you mean by this prescription? Methodism knows nothing of exaction. This is more than a caricature—it is a *libel* upon the system, and the adherents of Methodism. I might prove this by argument; but as this is what you "deprecate," as you prefer "statement to disputation," I will not dispute, but make a simple statement. In the Rules of the Society, as formed by Mr. Wesley, and which remain unaltered to the present day, the following are his own words, in the year 1782:—"Every member contributes one penny weekly, (*unless he is in extreme poverty,*) and one shilling quarterly." Is this exaction? Religion must have done little, very little, for that individual, in changing his habits and forming his principles, curtailing his expenses, and regulating his habits of frugality and industry, who feels it an oppression to contribute one penny per week, and one shilling per quarter, towards the support of that ministry by which he has been reclaimed from sin, and led to practise holiness; and yet there are thousands of the poor who do not contribute the small amount just mentioned, and who are liberally relieved when in sickness, age, and deep poverty. There is *no exaction* practised either on the rich or poor. A money qualification, either for membership or official station, is absolutely unknown in the polity of the Wesleyans. The other contributions, the number of which has been disingenuously multiplied by one of your anonymous correspondents, are for the promotion of objects similar in character to those which receive the pecuniary support of other denominations; and if the Wesleyans did not support them, they would as certainly expose themselves to the severity of your censure, as their liberality obtained for them, in their pecuniary arrangements, your admiration and decided approbation, in "The Witness," October, 1844, in your laudatory article on "*Methodism and Money.*" I know not a better antidote to your recent attack upon us, (you call it "friendly strictures!") than is to be found in your own words. The following are a few specimens of your praise:—"There is less of miracle in the matter than *covetousness* and indolence affect to believe. Every man contributes as if he were its sole patron and supporter." After having stated the character and objects of the various Funds of Methodism, and given a brief but comprehensive view of its *financial* system; in your concluding paragraph you say, "The great peculiarity of Methodism is, that the *scale of contribution* is *properly adjusted*, and *universally acted* upon. But how can they sustain such an amount of increasing contribution? How, after the proper maintenance of their families and credit, can they possibly sustain it? Sustain it! IT SUSTAINS THEM! They thrive and flourish under it! *Methodism is enriching thousands!* IT IS IMPOVERISHING NONE! Its great danger, at this moment, is from the rising respectability of its people! The Methodists do much; but they COULD DO MUCH MORE! Take the sum total of their contributions, and divide it by the aggregate of their numbers, and you will find the sum FOR EACH IS REALLY SMALL. Take an equal number from equal ranks of the population, and compute the sums they spend needlessly, or hurtfully, or sinfully, in various ways, and it will probably amount to SEVEN TIMES the sum spent by the Methodists in support of Gospel institutions. Mammon has still the loaf, and Christ the crumbs; 'selfishness is the antagonist of the Gospel,' and 'covetousness the sin of the Christian church.'"

I place in juxtaposition the testimony of the "Christian Witness" in October, 1844, and in January, 1847; and I leave the reader to form his own judgment, not merely as to the system, which by the same writer is lauded in the one "Witness," and misrepresented in the other; but as to the degree of confidence which ought to be reposed in a writer who can go to such



opposite extremes in his description of Methodism. Yet this is a *Christian Witness!*

3. "*And before all, above all, and beyond all, let the unholy system of mixed fellowship be forthwith abrogated.*" This prescription professedly involves such a knowledge of the character of the members of the Wesleyan Societies as justifies the writer in assuming that a large proportion of the Wesleyans are not converted men. This is a subject of vast importance, and merits the most serious attention; and in reference to which I submit to the consideration of the reader the following remarks:—

I do not subscribe to your statement, that none but converted men ought to be admitted as members of the visible church of Christ. You assume, but you do not attempt to prove, that none but converted men were admitted as members of the church in the Apostolic times. "In Apostolic times the churches, as far as man could judge, were composed of believers." I admit that none but believers became members; but if the word "believers" be employed by you in the sense of "converted,"—and if not, there is no force in the statement,—then I demur to that statement. On the day of Pentecost, when there was such a gracious and glorious effusion of the Holy Ghost, and when "three thousand souls" were "added to the church," it is assumed, rather than proved and demonstrated, that they were all converted. I admit that this is the popular, and it may be the true, opinion; but still I maintain that it is neither stated in the narrative, nor can it be proved from the facts recorded, that all those who were added were really converted. It will be admitted without controversy that Ananias and Sapphira were members of the church; but were they converted? If falsehood, covetousness, and an ostentatious display of affected liberality, be not the fruits of conversion, then they were *not* converted. But they were members of the church! If they *were* converted, and if falsehood, covetousness, and an ostentatious display of affected liberality, be *not* the fruits of conversion, then they had *fallen from grace*. And in that case what becomes of the *doctrine of the final and unconditional perseverance of the saints*? Either the one or the other position must be abandoned!

The same observation is applicable to the case of Simon the Sorcerer, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, chap. viii. If every believer was converted, then Simon was converted; for it is stated "Simon himself believed also; and when he was baptized, he continued with Philip;" but after he believed and had been baptized, by which he had been publicly recognised as a member of the church, Peter said unto him, "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter; for thy heart is *not right* in the sight of God. Repent, therefore, of this thy *wickedness*, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee; for I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity." (Acts viii. 21—23.) Simon was a believer, and therefore, on your principle, he must have been a member of the church: he was also baptized, but was he converted? If you say he was *not*, then he could not have been a member of the church; for you say none but converted men were admitted into the church! If you say he *was* converted, then how comes it to pass that his heart was not right in the sight of God,—that he was to repent of his *wickedness*,—that he was in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity? If he was *in* the church, he was a wicked man, and not converted, unless he had fallen from grace! in which case it proves that in Apostolic times church membership was *not* confined to converted men. If he was *not* recognised as a member of the church, then it follows that those who believed and were baptized were not invariably admitted to church membership; but it appears that on the day of Pentecost, addition to the church was the result of being baptized!

It would be quite easy to multiply passages from the Apostolic Epistles, to show that the primitive church numbered among its members those who either had not been converted; or they very soon experienced a sad relapse,—"*the salt having lost its savour.*" Nothing can be more dangerous, or tend more to embarrass the argument between the Christian and the infidel, than to maintain



that all the members of the primitive church had been converted. I use the word converted, in its legitimate sense, as indicating a change of heart, accompanied by a change of practice. This may be a favourite crotchet of yours; but it is untenable, and cannot be supported by scriptural evidence; and in an argument of such importance as that to which we now refer, we shall submit to no subordinate authority, as we heartily subscribe to the Sixth Article of the Church of England:—"Whatsoever is not read therein, (the Scriptures,) nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith."

As your words apply to the Apostolic churches, perhaps you may not object to a reference to the formation of the church, by the Head of the Church, the great Master himself. I shall assume, what I suppose you will admit, that the first disciples of Christ were the first members of the Church of Christ. Was Judas a disciple? Certainly he was. Was he an Apostle? Certainly he was,—and therefore he must have been a member of the church. Was he converted? Doubtless he was. Did he retain the grace of God which he received at conversion? Certainly not: "he fell from the ministry and apostleship, by transgression." (Acts i. 25.) Was he expelled from the church when the *sa't* had lost its savour? Certainly not. He was permitted to participate with the other disciples in the "last supper," when the emblems of the Redeemer's body and blood were administered by the hands of the great Master himself. If conversion be essential to membership in the Church of Christ, on the same principle the continuance in that state of communion must be suspended on the same condition! But Judas was not expelled from the church. "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? He spake of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve." (John vi. 70, 71.) Judas either *was* or *was not* converted. If converted when he became a disciple, he was continued and recognised as a disciple by the Head of the Church himself, after he had lost the grace of conversion. "One of you is a devil: he spake of Judas." If he was not converted, then conversion was not essential to church membership. It is, to the argument, a matter of indifference which form of the dilemma you prefer. Make your choice.

To prevent misapprehension, I wish it to be distinctly understood, that I would not, by this argument, lessen, in the estimation of the reader, the importance of conversion. I would rather give it, if possible, greater importance. My object is to guard against the imposition of a condition of membership with the visible church of God, which neither He, nor Jesus Christ, nor the Apostles, have enjoined. It is a *new* term of communion, to which I thus enter my most solemn protest.

You affirm that "membership among the Methodists is more than ordinarily a doubtful index to conversion." Is it consistent with Christian candour, for Dr. Campbell to use the word "conversion" in one sense, when he knows, or ought to know, that Mr. Caughey and the Wesleyans use it in another? They mean by "conversion" a change of heart produced by the Holy Spirit in the regeneration of the soul; but Dr. Campbell means simply repentance! Is this in harmony with what ought to be the testimony of a "Christian Witness!" I have no difficulty in declaring that never did the Methodists make conversion the condition of membership. There has been no secret, no mystery, about this. The Rules of the Society, as drawn by John and Charles Wesley, in 1743, distinctly state, "There is one only condition previously required of those who desire admission into these societies; namely, '*a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins.*'" But whenever this is really fixed in the soul, it will be shown by its fruits. It is therefore expected of all who continue therein, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation, *First*, By doing no harm, by avoiding evil in every kind; especially that which is most generally practised." I should be glad to copy the *fifteen* matters particularly specified under this condition; but I am apprehensive that they would extend my letter to an inconvenient length. "*Secondly*, It is expected of all who continue in these societies, that

they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation, *by doing good, &c. Thirdly, By attending upon all the ordinances of God,* &c. I should rejoice to be allowed to introduce to your readers, who according to your own magnificent conceptions must be innumerable, ("We have testified; the nations have listened, and are now pondering the testimony: our jurisdiction is not confined to England and the Independents; it is co-extensive with the great globe, and the church of the living God!!") an entire copy of the Rules of the Methodist Society. The more they are examined, the more they will commend themselves to men of candour and piety. They prohibit nothing but what is injurious; they enjoin nothing but what is reasonable and scriptural; there is nothing trifling, nothing merely ceremonial: they are as far removed from the mummeries of Popery, as from the ceremonies of Puseyism.

Though conversion (I use the word not in the sense of repentance, but as indicating that change of heart, produced by the Holy Ghost, by which man is made a new creature in Christ Jesus) is not the condition of membership, yet the Wesleyan Ministers, as a body, insist upon conversion as faithfully as other Ministers; and their members of society, as well as the hearers in their congregations, are not left in a state of ignorance as to the condition on which, to use your own language, they are to be "invested with all the privileges of the kingdom of God." You appear to make the enjoyment of those privileges dependent upon what you call "emancipation" from certain prudential regulations, which are integral parts of Wesleyan polity, and which are but as the scaffolding to the building; and though important in their relative position, the Wesleys never think of confounding them with the building itself; as they can not only "approve things that are excellent," but they can distinguish things that differ; but upon your principles the enjoyment of such privileges does not depend upon conversion, but upon the possession of some undefined power—which you call emancipation!

You affirm, or at least you subscribe to the affirmation, that there "never was a period in the history of Methodism when so large a number of unconverted men were nominally in church fellowship;" and you proceed to say, "the fittest man alive, perhaps, to settle this point, is the celebrated American Minister, the Rev. James Caughey. His knowledge, acuteness, and candour, alike qualify him to bear a decisive testimony in the matter; and such testimony he has borne." You proceed to say, that his letters are "a marvellous repository of important sentiments and striking facts, pervaded by a fervid tone of religious enthusiasm, occasionally a little wild, but which attracts more than it repels; a work which may be read by all sections of the church with more than ordinary advantage."

I do not admit the superior competency of Mr. Caughey to give evidence upon the points at issue, nor is his testimony entitled to the deference which you explicitly award to it.

You declare that his letters are "pervaded by a fervid tone of religious enthusiasm;" and are "occasionally a little wild." I put it to your sober judgment, and that of your readers, Is the testimony of a man to be implicitly received, and that, too, as that of the "fittest man alive," which is "pervaded by a fervid tone of religious enthusiasm," and is a "little wild?" What man possessed of an understanding, capable of comprehending the subject, does not see, that such a witness is *not* entitled to implicit deference? In any court, either of equity, or justice, common sense, or Christian candour, is a man to be acknowledged as "the fittest man alive" to give evidence upon a case, when the advocate by whom he is introduced into the witness-box informs the jury that his testimony is "pervaded by a fervid tone of religious enthusiasm—occasionally a little wild!" In the name of common sense, to say nothing of British justice, and Christian candour, I protest against such a character, being "the fittest man alive" to give evidence in such a case; and I shall marvel exceedingly if the religious public receive with implicit deference the testimony of such a witness.

That Mr. Caughey has occupied some of the largest chapels in the Wesleyan Connexion, in Ireland and England, during the last *six* years, and has preached

to very large congregations; and that this has been a violation of that clause, in the *Deed Poll*, as executed by Mr. Wesley, which legally defines the Conference, and the power which the members thereof *may*, or *may not* exercise, and which declares that "the Conference should not, nor might, nominate nor appoint any person to the use and enjoyment of, or to preach and expound God's holy word in, any of the chapels and premises so given or conveyed, who was not *either a member of the Conference, or admitted into connexion with the same, or upon trial*," (Mr. Caughey being neither a member of the Conference, nor admitted into connexion with the same, nor upon trial,) I admit: yet the occupancy of our pulpits, and addressing large congregations, will not make a man, "the fittest man alive," to give evidence on the subject of the religious state of the Methodist Societies. I intend nothing disrespectful to Mr. Caughey, or offensive to his numerous admirers, when I state, that during the time I have resided in Hull, on the very spot where he laboured the longest, and in the estimation of his admirers the most successfully, I have not yet ascertained, that he mingled generally with the members in their class-meetings, and conversed with them individually, as the other Ministers do, once every quarter; and thus obtained accurate information respecting the actual state of their religious knowledge and experience. I cannot ascertain that he ever visited the sick, or entered the habitations of the poor, or mingled generally with the people: and I cannot understand how a man is competent to give evidence on such a subject, who has not availed himself of the only means, by which he can acquire information respecting the state of individual members, which alone renders him competent to speak of the aggregate body of the Wesleyan Societies. Mr. Caughey doubtless held exciting meetings, and large numbers were converted, or professed to be converted: but does it accord, either with common candour, or Christian charity, to make statements, grounded upon the admissions of the *few*, to the disparagement of the multitude? Take the case of Leeds, as stated by Mr. Caughey, and quoted by yourself. The four Circuits in Leeds, according to the Minutes of last Conference, contain *seven thousand seven hundred and seventy-six members*. Though it ought to be a matter of regret, yet need it be one of surprise, to ascertain, that in such a multitude there are those to be found, who do not even profess to have been converted? Out of "one thousand" converted, according to Mr. C.'s statement, in Leeds, about "six hundred" were members of the society. Will you engage to produce an equal number of church members, in which there shall not be found a similar proportion of those who, "though desirous of fleeing from the wrath to come," are not unconverted? Nothing tends more to multiply hypocrites, the bane of the church, and the curse of the world, than to induce people to profess to have been converted, when they are yet in their sins. "By their fruits ye shall know them!"

To prevent all misapprehension I wish to be understood as attaching the greatest possible importance to conversion. It is from a sense of its absolute necessity, and paramount importance, that I think there ought not to be that eagerness, which is sometimes evinced, to induce sincere penitents who are seeking mercy, to profess that they are the subjects of conversion. Whenever that change of heart is experienced, in which conversion really consists, there will be the avoidance of those feelings which are prohibited, and the exhibition of those tempers which are enjoined by St. Paul:—"Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil-speaking, be put away from you, with all malice; and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." (Eph. iv. 31, 32.)

Though I am anxious to notice *all* the matters to which you and your correspondents object, yet the fear of extending this letter beyond the proper limits, will prevent me protracting my observations: but I must observe, that the association of laymen with the Ministers, in the Conference, is not the panacea, though you prescribe it as the specific cure for all our evils. The experiment has been tried, according to your own statement, by the "four sister sects;" yet "they all unite with the parent body in confessing and

deploring the absence of that Divine power, by which they were made to triumph." What a prescription! What an admission! What would a patient think of his physician, who prescribed a specific remedy for some defined disease, but who told him at the same time, that in *every case* in which it had been applied, it had been a perfect failure! How greatly would that enhance the value of the medicine, and inspire confidence in the skill of the physician!

You ascribe much of our assumed spiritual inefficiency to what you call our "National Church Predilections." You will, I presume, admit that the Wesleyans possess the right, as men, as Englishmen, and as Protestants, to exercise liberty of conscience, liberty of thought, and liberty of action. On this ground you justify your opposition to the National Church. The liberty you claim for yourself, we claim for ourselves. We, the Wesleyans, have no wish to dragoon you and your associates; and we will take care that you shall not dragoon us, into your mode of thinking, and speaking, and acting, in reference to the Establishment principle. The liberty you claim, we claim; the liberty you exercise, we exercise; and no man, nor any number of men, shall deprive us of this our birthright.

Think not, from this assertion of the right of private judgment, that I am blind (I speak only for myself, not for my brethren) to the defects, or indifferent to the assumptions, or ignorant of the abuses, of the National Establishment of this country: but I distinguish between the acorn, and the widely and deeply rooted oak; between an Establishment to be formed, and that which has taken such deep root, and entwined itself around all the institutions, and has become an integral part of the constitution of the land. To *prevent* the formation of such a body is one thing; to *uproot* it, is another.

That the National Establishment of this country is a mighty engine, capable of producing either the weal or the woe of this country, must be admitted. That a reformation in the National Establishment is necessary, desirable, and practicable, I believe; but that her separation from the State is necessary to effect that reformation, with my present views and knowledge, (and declamation however boisterous, or abuse however impertinent, will neither correct the former, nor increase the latter,) I am not prepared to admit, and therefore I deny. I blame no one for thinking otherwise; and I am totally indifferent as to what others may think of me, because I exercise the right of doing as they do,—thinking for myself.

The assumed political bearings of the Body are spoken of as one reason of our want of success. Methodism, as such, is not, and I hope it never will become, a political body. The Wesleyans, as such, have no political creed. A man, by becoming a member of the Wesleyan society, does not surrender his civil rights, as a citizen of the world. Have not politics been a bane to the National Church? After such an instance of mischief, why should the Wesleyans, as a religious body, encumber themselves with a millstone, which will cool their zeal, cripple their energies, and prevent their success?

That Wesleyans, in their civil character, as the citizens of the world, prompted by piety, loyalty, and patriotism, should take an interest in that which affects the moral, religious, civil, and commercial prosperity of the land of their birth, is to be regarded as a duty, and a privilege. Ominous of evil would be that day when the affairs of the nation are left to the management of wicked and ungodly men. In politics, as well as in religion, men ought to think and act for themselves.

"The apparent indifferentism, or contempt, avowed for the Temperance movement," is alleged as a reason for our want of success. The "indifference or contempt" for the Temperance movement is a gratuitous assumption. That this is "avowed," is more than an assumption: it belongs to that category of things prohibited, to which the precept is applicable, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour."

That the Wesleyans have not united themselves with the so-called Temperance Societies, is admitted, and defended, (I speak individually, as I write neither *for* nor *from* men,) on the following grounds:—1. The Wesleyan

Society has been from the beginning a Temperance Society: it is enjoined in the Rules of 1743; and from that time to this those Rules have always been in print, and before the public. 2. The Temperance movement, to which the Wesleyans are affirmed to have been indifferent, is not necessarily associated with, or grounded upon, religious principles. Religion, as such, is no part or parcel of the Temperance principle. A man may be as wicked as it is possible for a human being to be, and yet he is recognised as a member of such a Society. A man may be as holy as it is possible for a human being to be, and yet he will be denounced as an intemperate man. Such incongruities are utterly at variance with every principle of reason and religion. Religion must be at the root of every reformation, either in the principles or practice of man. Dissever reformation from religion, and disappointment must be the result.—“A bad tree cannot bring forth good fruit.”

These, so far as I can perceive, are the chief points, on which you, and your correspondents, have thought it discreet and charitable to attack the Wesleyans. I disclaim that which has been imputed to me, as being their champion. I write of, and for, and from myself. I have consulted no one. As one of your correspondents has addressed to me a letter in “The Witness,” asking my opinion on an act of discipline to which he was subject in Derby some years ago, I have no difficulty in saying, that the case, as stated by him, (*I say, as stated by him*, which, after all, may be an *ex parte* statement, and of which I know nothing except from his letter; for though I have resided three years in Derby since the transaction took place, yet he never consulted me there!) was not according to the printed Rules; it was not scriptural; it was tyrannical. But this case no more affects the general argument, than it would, to affirm, that because a Magistrate may sometimes act in an arbitrary manner, therefore the government of this country is one of pure despotism! The constitution of the country, and also of Methodism, makes provision for an appeal; and the man who will not exercise his right to appeal, ought not, at any subsequent period, to claim the crown of martyrdom!

Your last Number supplies ample evidence, that in the pages of “The Christian Witness,” personality is as acceptable as statement; and much more so than argument: and as this discussion, which you have provoked, cannot be continued by me without exposing myself to the scurrility of some of your correspondents, (may I be allowed to congratulate you on the acquisition of such dignified and powerful auxiliaries?) my present, must be my final, communication; and however boisterous may be your triumph, and protracted the personal attacks of your anonymous correspondents, I shall maintain by my silence, that the word “Christian” ought to be erased from your title-page; and that the “Witness” is utterly unfit to be the “official organ of the Congregational Union of England and Wales.”

I am

Your faithful friend,  
W. VEVERS.

Rev. Dr. Campbell,  
Editor of “The Christian Witness,”  
London.

## PART II.

THE case of Mr. Caughey having excited some interest in the Wesleyan Connexion, it may not be improper and unseasonable to advert to the facts of that case. Mr. Caughey came from America to this country about *six years* ago, avowedly on a visit to his native land. On his arrival, the Annual Conference was meeting in Manchester, to which assembly he was admitted as a visiter from America, and treated with Christian courtesy by the Ministers then assembled. It was never understood by any one, nor I believe avowed by himself, that he would continue for any protracted period in this country. From that time, till the last Conference, it has been his habit to occupy our pulpits in various large towns. He never applied to the Conference, subsequent to his admission to its sittings in Manchester, to be present in that assembly; and at no period to occupy the pulpits, to which the *Conference alone* have the power of appointment. The Superintendents in the respective Circuits in which he has laboured have, on their *own responsibility*, admitted him to their pulpits. This case, which I believe is quite unparalleled in the history of any organized Christian Church, was the subject of conversation at the respective Conferences in 1843, 1844, and 1845; but, with a forbearance which was truly Christian, and with the understanding that Mr. Caughey would speedily return to America, no positive steps were taken till the last Conference, in 1846, when it became necessary to adopt decisive measures to terminate a course of proceeding which was totally at variance with the fundamental principles of Wesleyan polity, and the prudential arrangements of every Christian Church. Could the Conference have acted in a more tender, and courteous, and Christian manner, than they did in this case? They had no right to appoint, and it was only on the principle of Christian kindness that they did not immediately interdict this innovation. But how have Mr. Caughey and his admirers shown their sense of the kindness of the Conference? He has been loud in his complaints of ill usage; and *they* have been bitter (I regret to say bitter—for the truth ought to be spoken) in their accusations of the Conference, for proceedings which became necessary to prevent permanent mischief. What would be thought by men of sense, of any man who, after having been kindly and hospitably entertained as a visiter,—*I say, as a visiter,—and only as such*, but who, finding it convenient and comfortable to prolong his stay, gave indications of his purpose to become a permanent resident under the hospitable roof of his generous friend, and set at utter defiance the authority of his host, and adopted a course of proceeding necessarily tending to disturb the order and regularity of the family? I say, what would be thought, what ought to be thought, of the sense of gratitude of such a man who, on receiving kind and repeated, and significant hints from his host, that the visit was too protracted; and, finally, that the time had arrived when it must positively terminate, he turned round upon his host and said,—What! am I to be treated thus? after having entertained me so kindly and hospitably for so *long* a time, am I to leave your house, and cease to partake of your hospitality? Where would be the gratitude of such a guest? But, suppose that he made his appeal to the public? I leave the public to determine what would be, what ought to be, their opinion of such hospitality on the part of the host, and such gratitude on the part of the guest!

But the case of Mr. Caughey and the Wesleyan Conference involves principles infinitely more momentous, as affecting the peace and stability of Methodism, than, I apprehend, is generally understood. The Conference cannot—I say *CANNOT*—appoint any man to minister in any chapel, legally settled in the terms of the Poll-Deed executed by Mr. Wesley, except on the *conditions* distinctly stated in that deed; one clause of which I have previously given. It is well known,—*it ought to be generally known*,—that every Pastor appointed by the Conference has to undergo an examination, *twice* every year, —at the District-Meeting and Conference—as to his moral character, belief of



our doctrines, approval of our discipline, and his ability for the pastoral work; and every Local Preacher in the Connexion has to undergo a similar examination *four* times in the year; and on a satisfactory answer to such questions, depends the power of the Conference to appoint to the occupancy of the pulpits. But in Mr. Caughey's case no such questions can be put: he is accountable to no tribunal! Why should one man wish; or why should his admirers (who profess to be devoutly attached to the system of Methodism!) wish him, a stranger, having lived and laboured all his days in America, to be an exception,—*the* exception? If this deviation from established law and usage had been tolerated in the case of Mr. Caughey, why should it not be tolerated in the case of any and every Minister, especially of those who have lived long, and laboured hard in the Wesleyan Connexion, and whose past morality, orthodoxy, and ministerial character, might be fairly taken as a guarantee for future consistency? But has this ever been attempted by the Conference? Never! and never will! Dark indeed would be that day, should it ever dawn, (which may God forbid!) when the Conference should cease to require strict conformity to its laws in reference to *character*, not taken for granted, but *attested* in the proper Methodistical manner, in reference to *all* its members, no matter what may be their talents, piety, and usefulness. This annual investigation of the character of Wesleyan Ministers is a guarantee to their congregations and societies, that their pulpits shall not be occupied by improper men. I mean nothing unkind or disrespectful to other denominations when I say, that there is nothing approaching to this conservative principle, which is always in practical operation, in any other section of the Church of Christ, as is found in the system of Methodism! And the man who seeks, either by an avowed or insidious movement, to undermine this pillar of Methodism, is a traitor to the system, and a foe to its adherents. "I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say."

There is another aspect in which the case of Mr. Caughey has been put; and I advert to it merely to expose its preposterousness. It has been said, Why have not the Methodist Conference invited him to become a member of their body? Only think for a moment of this notion! The Methodist Conference inviting an individual to become a member of their body! They could not have done it, if they would, on any principle of Christian consistency. Mr. Caughey was a Minister of the American Church. Could the English Conference invite a member of that body to leave his previous associates and unite with them? What a compliment! what an insult this would have been to their American brethren! *They ought not to have done it, if they could!* What could have conduced more to puff up the individual invited with pride? What could have more palpably prostrated a large body of Christian Ministers than to invite *one* individual to become a member of their body? What would have been more at variance with Mr. Caughey's habits and proceedings? He has never attempted, or even betrayed the wish, to engage in the ordinary work of a Wesleyan Minister in this country. His habit has been to occupy exclusively some large chapel, in some large town, for weeks or months in succession. Let this mode of proceeding become general, and Methodism, as a system, is extinct. Besides, Mr. Caughey avowedly acts under the influence of *impressions* received from Heaven. Suppose he had an impression that he ought to preach in one of the pulpits of the Established Church, or among the Nonconformists, would they allow it? Could they be blamed for refusing it? A man who acts under the influence of *impressions*, is above all law; and as he will not regulate his conduct by principles commonly recognised among men in civil and religious communities, he has no right to complain of those by whom he has been kindly treated, and by whose forbearance he has for *six* years been allowed to occupy the pulpits. If he had an *impression* that he ought to occupy the Wesleyan pulpits, why may not the members of the Conference have an *impression* that he ought not? Who shall determine which is the divine impression? The probability certainly is in favour of that of the greatest number. If the salvation of souls be the only object which such a man seeks to accomplish, the necessity of such work is as great on the American continent

as in this country; and the importance of salvation is as great in America as in England. Let any man of candour, capable of understanding the matter at issue between Mr. Caughey and the Conference, calmly consider the case, and he will see that forbearance, to the utmost limits to which it could be extended, has been the spirit of the Conference, and that gratitude ought to be the disposition manifested by Mr. Caughey.

If the Wesleyan Conference had continued to connive at the occupancy of their pulpits by a man not authorized by them, as in the case of Mr. Caughey, why might they not have done it in other cases; and what would have been the consequence to the Wesleyan Connexion? If a Superintendent, from the pressure from without, allow such a departure from law and usage, to gratify others, why may he not act upon the same principle, to *gratify himself*? and who could consistently blame him for introducing a man holding sentiments at variance with those held by the Wesleyan body? Grant the principle in one case, and why not in another? And it is impossible to determine what may be the result of its continuous operation: "it is like the letting out of water," and would be subversive of Methodism. When the present effervescent feeling has subsided, those who have most firmly adhered to the principles of Wesleyan polity, in reference to the occupancy of the pulpits, will be acknowledged to have acted the most consistently, and most in harmony with the peace and stability of Methodism.

---

#### POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE I wrote my remarks respecting the case of Mr. Garner, of Derby, and the Trustees of a chapel who are said to be indebted to him for money lent, but which he says he cannot now recover, being prevented by the "Statute of Limitations," I have received information, from a source upon which I can place implicit reliance, which justifies me in making the following statement. It is well known that Mr. Garner was once a Wesleyan Minister; and he knows the reason why he is not one now. The money in question was the property of the late Mrs. Garner; or at least was claimed by her, during a period when she and her husband lived in a state of separation. It was during this season that an effort was made by the contributions of the Trustees and other friends, aided by a grant from the Chapel Relief Fund, when Mrs. Garner, *not knowing that her husband was alive*, and claiming the disposal of what she *and* others—her friends and the Trustees—regarded as *her own property*, VOLUNTARILY CONTRIBUTED the money in question for the relief of the chapel; and new Trustees were appointed. Why did not Mr. Garner make his demand at that time? Doubtless for prudential reasons. It was not till *four years* after this new settlement of the Trust, and *one year* after the death of Mrs. Garner, that he claimed the property. *He knows* that during the *nine* or *ten* years in which he made no application for the money, neither Mrs. Garner nor her brother, nor the Trustees, had the least knowledge of his being alive; and it was during this period of supposed interment—but what actually was prudential privacy—that the debt upon the chapel was liquidated, the new Trustees appointed, and the money to which he now professes to have a title, but of which he says he is debarred by the "Statute of Limitations," was *voluntarily subscribed* by the only person then known to be alive, possessed of a legitimate title either to receive the interest or to dispose of the principal. How different this statement from that which he describes as his "unvarnished tale!" Where is the candour of giving the statement Mr. Garner gives? Where is the Christian justice of a man who *knows nothing* of the *real facts* of this case, proclaiming it to the world as an evidence of the "despotism" of the Conference? Is any man safe under such a system of vituperation? and that too from a professedly "Christian Witness?"



# A FALSE WITNESS FURTHER UNMASKED.

---

BY THE REV. JOHN S. STAMP.

---

"We, (the Congregational Union,) they, (the Wesleyan Methodists,) and I, (not Dr. George, but Dr. John Campbell,) are now fairly in for it, and must go through with it."—*Speech of Dr. Campbell at the Congregational Union, May 14, 1847. Patriot Newspaper, May 20, 1847.*

IN one of the Meetings of "The Congregational Union," held on Friday, May 14th, the "good" Editor of "The Christian Witness" is represented as having said as follows:—"One word on the subject of Methodism. It has annually been my wont, with the view of advancing the glory of God, and the good of his Churches, to sweep with my eye the whole Evangelical horizon, and repeat to my readers how the conflict with the world of darkness was proceeding; and in doing this at the opening of the present year, in due course I lighted on the realm of Methodism, concerning which I reported according to the facts of the case; and I appeal to every man who now hears me, whether the article comprising that report was not *framed by candour*, and *pervaded by a spirit of Christian kindness, not to say generosity (?)* Having exercised my judgment, and delivered my conscience, I contemplated nothing further; I had not the most distant idea of following up the matter in the way of assault or controversy; and I submit there was nothing in the article aforesaid that ought to have given particular offence, and that warranted such a tempest of clamour, such a flood of calumny, as that which has followed. *I confidently affirm there was not.* Had the Methodists exercised a wise discretion, they would have taken my counsel for what it was worth, and endeavoured to profit from it. But they have judged otherwise. We, (the Congregational Union,) they, and I, are now fairly in for it, and must go through with it. *I will yield to no man on earth in my love for all that is lovely among the Methodists.* For the proof I point to the labours of a life-time. I have written more in praise of its better parts, many times over, than all the gentlemen united who now hear me. But I intensely hate, I have ever hated, the despotism of the system; and, but for that, I might most probably not have been standing here this day." Thus oracularly spoke our Editor. An individual of the name of Hill, from Stafford, of whom we have neither heard nor known anything, "wished to remind his brethren of the provocation which Dr. Campbell had received to use harsh language; and it was a marvel to hear *that he was so moderate (!)* The Magazines had a wide circulation among the Methodists, and it would prove a great benefit to let them into the secrets of their despotic masters. He predicted for the worthy Editor, when some man in the Hanbury succession should undertake to write the memorials of the present Dissenting generation, the reward of posthumous fame, as he believed him deserving of the most profound gratitude and admiration of the present age." Stuff, insufferable! These ebullitions of the Stafford satellite might feed the vanity and glut the appetite of the "good" Editor; but in the estimation of the truly

pious, zealous, and respectable members of that assembly, they were listened to with pain, and repelled with disgust. Dr. Campbell, innocent soul! wrote an article on the subject of Methodism, which he declares was "framed by candour, and pervaded by a spirit of Christian kindness, not to say generosity;" but, of which document, others, who are far more qualified to judge, assert that "it is a wanton, unprovoked, and gratuitous attack made upon Methodism and its Ministers—with a bitterness amounting almost to malignity, and a personality approaching the scurrilous." We are, then, fairly at issue. Dr. Campbell also declared,—“We, they, and I are fairly in for it.” Now this was uncontradicted; although we find present on that occasion the Rev. Dr. Morison, Messrs. J. A. James, Thomas James, John Ely, Algernon Wells, and many others: “*we*,” the Congregational Union, “*they*,” the Wesleyan Methodists, and “*I*,” the celebrated Dr. Campbell, “are fairly in for it, and must go through with it.” Be it so. We are nothing loth.

In the wretched attempts which have been made by the Editor of the “Christian Witness,” and “Organ of the Congregational Union,” to disturb and injure a hitherto peaceful and inoffensive class of the community, none can fail remarking his want of regard to truth. On this point, in the first place, we must again *unmask* the gentleman. Our former attempt to do this was attended with many beneficial results, though annoying and vexatious to the “good” Editor himself, who blustered and was boisterous in a painful degree to his friends and admirers, some of whom, we are told, were fearful of the consequences: this we might be disposed to regret, did not the notable saying of the “pugnacious” individual come in to the rescue,—“truth, truth, eternal truth!” We are therefore urged onward in our career of duty, though it be to *unmask* and to castigate. Our readers well know that certain statements were made in the *veracious* (!) Magazine over which the Reverend individual presides, so as to place before the public a direct falsehood. This fallacy was proved in the Wesleyan Magazine; this was again and again proved in the pamphlets of Mr. Vevers and of Mr. James; and the memory of our “good” Editor was also refreshed on the subject, when he had to submit to our own *unmasking*; yet to this hour Dr. Campbell has neither modified, nor withdrawn, nor even alluded to the mendacious statement. The Editor of the so-called “Christian Witness” has given publicity to a statement which, by a competent and indisputable witness, has been proved incorrect and false; of this the *honourable* gentleman is aware; nevertheless, he suffers the mendacious statement to remain in its original form, uncontradicted and unexplained. Painful as it is to use seemingly harsh terms, nevertheless, “truth, truth, eternal truth,” compels us to say, that so long as the Editor refrains from publicly acknowledging his error, and correcting the assertion which he made, he is guilty of conduct which in all civilized society would be deemed dishonest and uncourtous, ungentlemanlike and dishonourable.

In the prosecution of our humiliating task to *unmask* the utter truthlessness of the Reverend Editor of the Congregational Official Organ, we must for the sake of “truth, truth, eternal truth,” advert to the conduct which he has pursued with regard to the Church of England, which has called forth a correspondence by no means creditable to our gratuitous assailant. A paper appeared a few months ago, on the pages of “The Christian Witness,” relative to the Irish Church, which was proved by competent authority to contain bare-faced falsehoods. These mendacious statements were refuted before the public, in a manner the most tangible, courteous, and candid; nevertheless the so-called “Christian Witness” has not contained a single word of apology or retraction. Upwards of fifteen months have elapsed, and to this hour the Editor has never had the honesty to ask pardon for circulating such misrepresentations amongst the portion of the community least likely to possess the means of detecting their dishonesty. What barefaced hypocrisy to talk about “truth, truth, eternal truth!” Bah!

Since our last publication was before the world, a paper has appeared in “The Christian Witness,” entitled, “The Church of England: Whose is it?” which has given rise to a correspondence which has appeared in the news-

papers, and which is calculated, even more than the article itself, to exhibit the reckless character of the "official organ," and the total want of moral principle in the publication which the Independents have selected as their representative. We say nothing at present of the article itself. Mr. Seeley describes the paper in question, as "unreasonable, absurd, and unjust;" and shows on irrefragable evidence, that the *veracious* Editor of the so-called "Christian Witness," "has, from some old documents, stated the stipends of Curates to be on a scale now utterly unknown. That he has, also, from some old, and now useless return, stated the pluralities of the Church to exist to a degree far beyond the fact; and has forgotten to remark that a law which passed nine years since, is rapidly extinguishing them: and that he has borrowed, from some pamphlet estimated of no authority, a most exaggerated view of the revenues of the Church; and has neglected a more recent and correct return; chiefly (he fears) because it did not answer his purpose. Hence as a general result, I find, (says Mr. Seeley,) that *the whole of his facts* are grossly incorrect; and such being the case, it would obviously be a waste of time to deal with his deductions." Now, in what way do our readers imagine the great stickler for "truth, truth, eternal truth," met Mr. Seeley's calm and judicious remarks, and a request also to allow them to appear in the *false* Witness? Why, just in the same way as he sought to parry off, and avoid the gist of, Mr. VEVERS's pertinent and truthful remarks. He says, in his reply to the communication of Mr. Seeley, "It cannot be admitted in full; I have no objection to insert the main passages, with a comment (!)" He then offers to get rid of the affair altogether, by returning the manuscript. Mr. Seeley very justly observes, that "a Christian Witness should desire, before all other things, not to be found, even unintentionally, a *false witness*. My complaint was, that you (i. e., 'The Christian Witness') had represented the present rate of payment of Curates in a manner quite at variance with *the fact as it really is*; that you had represented the system of pluralities in the Church in a manner quite at variance with *the fact as it really is*; and that you had represented the aggregate property of the Church also in a manner quite at variance with *the fact as it really is*. On these points (continues Mr. Seeley) I appealed to authentic facts and documents." "But you say, that it 'cannot be admitted in full, but you have no objection to insert the main passages.' Now the letter was not long, nor violent, nor irrelevant. To say, that it 'cannot be admitted,' but that you will merely give 'passages from it,' does seem to me to be a plain denial of justice. If you persevere in it, which I can hardly imagine, I must trouble you to return my manuscript by post without delay." The thin-skinned Editor complains of Mr. Seeley as being "unnecessarily warm, and not very reasonable," as might be expected; and then, to make the matter short, which had become rather unpleasant and vexatious, he coolly returns the manuscript. Dr. Campbell was bound in honour to publish Mr. Seeley's letter; he declined to do so; and the mendacious statements yet remain unmodified and uncontradicted in the so-called "Christian Witness." "It is impossible," says a writer in one of the most respectable periodicals of the day, "to read these shuffling and evasive letters, from a person in Dr. Campbell's position in his own denomination, without real pain and humiliation. How any one could write them, who did not feel that he had been detected in making misrepresentations which he has not the courage or honesty to retract, it is difficult to understand. But what must be the spiritual condition of the denomination of which he is the official organ?"

At such wretched and dastardly proceedings, we were somewhat painfully interested, by the following paragraph in a letter which appeared in the newspapers, from the pen of one who had evidently seen and observed with grief the unprincipled conduct of our *pugnacious* Editor:—"Pray, Mr. Editor, is the Editor of 'The Christian Witness' a Jesuit? The perusal of what you inserted in your last paper has created a strong suspicion in my mind, that he is a disguised Jesuit. But whether he is so or not, he is evidently and manifestly influenced by the same spirit. That there were Jesuits among Dissenters in the time of Charles the First, has been often alleged, and most probably with

truth: and the present time is not unlike that in many things. But I will state my reasons for entertaining this suspicion:—1st. The enmity which the Editor manifests towards the Church, is more than Dissenting enmity; it is quite Popish, of all the most inveterate and bitter: it is the venom of the serpent, the poison of asps. 2d. HIS INDIFFERENCE TO WHAT IS TRUE. He seems to care nothing for the palpably *false* statements he has made public; and when Mr. Seeley offered to correct them, he contrived to get rid of Mr. Seeley's letter, in order, as it appears, that falsehoods may continue uncorrected. Now this indifference to what is true, is not what has hitherto been manifested by Dissenters in this country: it is entirely Popish, and what has ever characterized Jesuitism." We make no comment on this telling extract, but leave it as it is, to the intelligent portion of our readers.

We now proceed to *unmask* the Reverend gentleman with regard to his assertions respecting the publication of his *liberal* and *highly-vaunted* chapel-deed. We say the *publication* of it, because we shall ere long, and in this paper, direct our attention to a few of its slavish and tyrannical provisions. Not satisfied with contemptuously denominating the body of Wesleyan Ministers in London a *Divan*, he charges upon that body, in the absence of all proof, or even shadow of proof, the publication of that precious document, of which every Christian Minister ought to be ashamed,—“The Scheme, Rules and Regulations for the Maintainance and Conduct of Affairs of the Chapels called The Tabernacle and Tottenham Court Road Chapel.” Dr. Campbell is both chagrined and angry at the notoriety which has been given to it; and well he may. The Wesleyan Methodists, however, were no more concerned in the publication of that document, than Dr. Campbell himself; and yet with a recklessness of character, indicative only of his desperate cause, and his own utter want of moral principle, he promulgates the following infamous lie!

“Nothing in the annals even of religious controversy, so called, can be compared in point of perverse ingenuity, low cunning, dishonour, and dishonesty, with the course pursued towards ‘The Christian Witness,’ by the gentlemen of the Methodist Book-room Committee and their subalterns. In these respects it immeasurably exceeds everything that has come within our knowledge, and utterly destroys our confidence in their integrity. The advocates of the despotism are not governed by such vulgar considerations as rule the proceedings of other men. Their search is directed to other objects than arguments, pertinent, just, honourable; but such is their infatuation, that every step is a blunder, every collision a defeat! Their last stroke is an advance upon all the preceding. Thus, instead of betaking themselves to manly reason, and the Christian Scriptures, they somehow obtain a copy of ‘The Tabernacle Award,’ and straightway getting it printed, they issue the following advertisement.”—The whole is a tissue of unsophisticated and barefaced falsehoods!

We must stop a little longer here. Dr. Campbell says that the “Trust-deed is no more *his* than Dr. Bunting's! Dr. Campbell did not frame it; he did not even give, he had no power to give, the instructions from which it was drawn up; he knew not a word it contained till it was delivered, signed, and sealed, to the plaintiffs and defendants.” This is Dr. Campbell's account of the “award.” Now, gentle reader, hear what the other side says; and judge between a Doctor in Divinity and a Barrister-at-Law. The latter says, “I, the said William Fuller Boteler, took upon myself the burden of the said reference, and I have been attended, from time to time, by certain of the said relators and plaintiffs, and by the said defendants (William Bateman and John Campbell), and by the Counsel and Solicitors for the Attorney-General, and the said relators and plaintiffs, and the said defendants respectively; and divers witnesses have been examined, and much documentary evidence has been produced and read before me on one side and the other.” What detestable Jesuitry! The deed is *no more Dr. Campbell's than Dr. Bunting's*; he did not frame it; he knew not a word it contained; yet he attended the Barrister from time to time, either in person or by his Counsel or Solicitor, and assisted in laying before the Barrister “much documentary evidence,” which led to the

final "award." Such Jesuitical shuffling we expected from Stoneyhurst and Douay, from Dens' Theology, and Maldonatus, but not from the Tabernacle, or the "Christian Witness."

We beg to suggest to the Reverend Editor and his publisher, in these book-making times, the following as the title for a new volume, after having made a respectable request to "The Methodistic Divan" to assist them in aiding and abetting its circulation and sale:—

## Fables

BY

JOHN CAMPBELL, D.D.,

WHICH ORIGINALLY APPEARED IN THE SO-CALLED  
"CHRISTIAN WITNESS,"

WITH THE INTENTION OF

AIDING THE WESLEYAN METHODISTS IN THEIR EMANCIPATION  
FROM PRIESTLY DESPOTISM;

AND ARE NOW COLLECTED IN A VOLUME, TO EXHIBIT HOW FAR THE PRINCIPLES OF  
IGNATIUS LOYOLA MAY BE ADOPTED AND CARRIED OUT BY CONGREGATIONAL  
PASTORS AND THEIR FLOCKS.

If our suggestion, very humbly made, be not adopted, Dr. Campbell will probably favour us with an exposition, on the wrapper of the "Christian Witness," of these contradictory articles, free from all Jesuitical subterfuges and interpretation, so as to cause something like harmony with his hypocritical puff,—"truth, truth, eternal truth." Dr. Campbell is "fairly in" his own snare; and like the school-boy, who has been detected in a misdemeanour, and charged with the offence, he cries out,—"It wasn't me!" "I did not do it." But it won't do, Dr. Campbell!

We have not as yet done with this "Deed;" the publication of which seems to have galled the "good" Doctor so severely. His remarks are very unsatisfactory, because so very Jesuitical. He states that he was not concerned in drawing up the deed, and that he is, consequently, not answerable for its numerous and arbitrary provisions. For the sake of argument, we will suppose this to be the case, although we do not believe it: now he cannot deny that he accepted the pastoral care of those chapels under the said Trusts, and that he now holds them under it; nevertheless, he distinctly states, that he and his friends act in direct opposition to its provisions. He *modestly* assures us,— "The boast and glory of Dr. Campbell and his friends is, that with a deed in certain points 'GENDERING TO BONDAGE,' they have set up in the Tabernacle a government of perfect liberty. 'To the people of England' we say,—'Read' the Historical Sketch of Whitefield's Churches in our last number, and you will learn the views of liberty entertained by the Editor of the 'Christian Witness.'" We ask, where is the honour of such a proceeding? Where was the conscience of "good" Dr. Campbell, when he made this statement to the Christian public? Wherein does his conduct differ from the proceedings of those who, for so long a period, abused the benevolent Lady Hewley's Charities? They preached in the chapels which she endowed doctrines directly opposed to those, for the promulgation of which, those buildings were erected. Dr. Campbell in effect declares, that he uses Mr. Whitefield's chapels for the purpose of upholding ecclesiastical regulations in direct opposition to the views of that able and useful man, and in contravention of his chapel-deed. Had Dr. Campbell no faith in the Providence of God? Was he too much attached to the fleece of the flock, to risk any privation, or self-denial, that he must trample under foot the directions of the venerable Founder? Let Dr. Campbell

compare his conduct, in this respect, with that of the honoured and suffering fathers of Nonconformity, who resigned their livings in the Church of England when the Act of Uniformity was brought into operation; or, with the noble-minded men of the Free Church of Scotland, who left their pulpits and their manse, rather than play the hypocrite by a professed subjection to regulations of which their consciences did not approve. Others possessing the least *modicum* of honour would have resigned. Alas! Liberty—true liberty in the estimation of such men as Dr. Campbell is verily a valueless article!

We cannot yet give the go-by to this “perfection of liberty”—this famous “Award”—this “model-deed:” the “good” Doctor must not be irritated, inasmuch as he has brought the whole of our *unmasking* upon himself, and therefore he has himself wholly to thank for it. We have not forgotten the *kind* and *Christian-like* epithets which he has employed in reference to the Wesleyan body, and the equally *gracious* terms of his motley correspondents, to which he has given free and eager circulation. We allude to the following, which we have indifferently culled from the mass:—“I love Methodism, from its associations; but hate its *tyranny*, its *despotism*, and its power.”—“I am glad to find that many, even in the Methodist Society, are awake to the intrigues of a *despotic* priesthood which labours among them; and if it be not stopped, it will ultimately lead to Popery.”—“The feebleness and the cunning, the utter and uniform destitution of all that is large in view and generous in spirit, in the ‘Watchman,’ distinctly proclaim it a thing of *despotic* creation, and *despotic* control, to be used solely, although ineffectually, for the maintenance of *despotic* authority.”—“The devotees of Methodist *despotism* have abundant means of self-defence against what they improperly consider ‘an attack,’ in their own periodicals, which they have used with no sparing hand, and in a spirit not remarkable for scrupulosity.”—“The whole of the *despotic* organs are closed against a single line from the friends and advocates of freedom.”—“Our next communication presents a strong case of hardship which illustrates the peculiar workings of the *despotism* in a particular direction.”—“With all our good things, we are under a *despotic power*; and the system, if it be not reformed, will in all probability destroy itself.” The grandiloquence of the following effusion is really too rich to be omitted:—“Thousands of noble-minded Wesleyans, who have often blushed (?) in secret for the thralldom they have endured, *now* freed from the terrors of that system of espionage and inquisitorial tyranny which Mr. Ververs so facetiously calls a ‘prudential regulation,’ will rally round your glorious standard, and, wielding the divine weapon—‘truth, eternal truth,’—will smite and spare not till *despotism* is destroyed, and emancipated Methodism is raised to a level with the most free and honourable of the spiritual Churches of Christ.” (Hear! hear! hear!) “A *despotism* based on the voluntary principle is a castle built upon a precipice, which one gust of popular indignation may dash to atoms in the gulf below.”—“You have but to will it, and in a few short months the *despotism* will expire.”—“The labours of these excellent men, (the Local Preachers,) together with those of the Teachers of *five hundred thousand* children, have, as to appearance, been comparatively powerless.” Add to all this, we have the oracular expression of an individual of the name of Hill, who observed, “it would prove a great benefit to the Methodists to let them into the secrets of their *despotic* masters!”

Now, the Wesleyans take all the expletives contained in the foregoing extracts, for as much as they are worth, and not an atom more: they know from whence they have come, and the *animus* by which they have been dictated. “Good” Dr. Campbell professes to be scared almost out of breath and life at the idea of a despot, or the appearance of despotism. He, liberal soul! cannot exist where any relic of that demon is to be found. But mark the provisions of the Deed, (which Dr. Campbell confesses “engenders bondage,”) by which he consented to be governed, and on the strength of which profession, he was continued a Minister of the Tabernacle and Tottenham-Court-Road Chapel; and while you read, blush for fallen humanity,—for fickle, inconstant, and inconsistent man!



*"The Minister or Ministers shall also take upon themselves the duty of admitting, suspending, and excluding of members of the said chapels, with liberty to call in the assistance of the brethren, when, and as such Minister or Ministers shall think fit.*

*"That the Managers (of whom there are but four for the two chapels, the Tabernacle, and Tottenham-Court-Road Chapel) and Ministers, shall, from time to time, inform, and make themselves acquainted with the wishes and feelings of the Members attending the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, and the congregation worshipping at the said chapel, for the better directing of their judgment in the due performance and exercise of their respective duties and powers. BUT SO, NEVERTHELESS, AS THAT IT SHALL NOT BE NECESSARY OR REQUISITE FOR THE MANAGERS OR MINISTERS IN ANY CASE, TO CALL THE MEMBERS OR CONGREGATION TOGETHER, TO EXPRESS THEIR OPINION UPON ANY POINT; AND SO AS THAT THE MANAGERS OR MINISTERS SHALL NOT BE BOUND TO SUBMIT TO ANY RESOLUTIONS OR VOTES OF THE MEMBERS OR CONGREGATION, OR ANY PART THEREOF, ON ANY MATTER RELATING TO THE AFFAIRS OF THE SAID CHAPELS, CONTRARY TO THEIR OWN JUDGMENT."*

Did our readers ever read of a *despotism* more despotic than this? "Serious thoughts," says Dr. Campbell, "were *once* entertained of appealing to the Court to set aside the 'Award;' but weary of litigation, and having the matter wholly in their own hands, Dr. Campbell and his friends received the instrument as it stood," "notwithstanding its defects," and "in certain points gendering to bondage." Can the "good" Doctor redden with shame? We really think he ought. It is stated in the "Award," that he, as one of the defendants, attended before the Awarding Barrister: he was therefore a party in the whole affair, whatsoever he may say to the contrary. This is a settled point. Dr. Campbell tries to find a "loop-hole of retreat," by maligning the character, and impugning the probity of the Barrister, John Fuller Boteler, Esq., and asserting that "he was a stiff Churchman, and a rank Tory, who seeing everything through the characteristic medium of his church, his party, and his profession, travelled far beyond the matters in reference before him, meddling in things with which he had no concern, and, to complete his scheme, not seldom going in the teeth of the clearest evidence." So says Dr. Campbell. We ask, what on earth has all this malignant bluster, and libellous vituperation, to do with the question? Mr. Boteler had certainly as fair a reputation and character as those of the "good Doctor" to sustain; and nothing would tend to stain and repudiate such a character sooner than the conduct attributed to him by Dr. Campbell. Tory or Whig, Republican or Conservative, Churchman or Dissenter, Mr. Boteler had to make his Award according to the provisions of the original Deed; and we believe he did so, both honestly and honourably. Dr. Campbell and his friends "*thought*," yes, gentle reader, "*thought* of appealing to the Court to set aside the Award." Alas for such thoughts! They were like "the morning cloud and early dew." What steps did Dr. Campbell take "to set aside the award?" None. He was silent as the grave, and as unmoveable in his "Tabernacle House" as a post; preferring to enjoy the bread and cheese of Whitefield's Chapel, and to violate the provisions of the "Award," rather than to follow the example of the fathers of Non-conformity—and RESIGN!

The ungenerous and base attempts of "good" Dr. Campbell to throw the Wesleyan Societies into a state of confusion, by his unwarranted and impertinent interference with the ecclesiastical order of the body, cannot be too severely reprobated. He has had the presumption to call upon the Wesleyan Methodists to alter the constitution of their Conference! and recommends "the reduction of the present Conference, by at least two thirds; the blank to be filled by lay-representatives, popularly chosen from year to year—nothing short of this, he wisely says, nothing short of two laymen to one Minister, will meet the exigency, and secure true, reasonable, and lasting liberty to the people." All this proceeds with a singular grace from Dr. Campbell, the hero of "The Perfection of Liberty,"—"The Tabernacle Award," and "Whitefield's Chapel-

Deed!" especially as that document clothes the "good" Doctor and his coadjutors with the intangible power "of admitting, suspending, and excluding" those unfortunate wights, "the members of the said chapels." Sweet liberty this, Dr. Campbell, of driving all, and being driven by none! The fact is, what everybody knows, who possesses common sense, and professes to write on the affairs of the Wesleyan body, that the constitution of the Conference was not formed by the Ministers now existing, but by the founder of the Connexion; the legal security of all the Wesleyan chapels in the kingdom, depends upon the preservation of that body in its integrity according to its original settlement. Let our Editor of the Congregational Official Organ know, that this topic is not a new one to the Methodists; it occupied their attention half a century ago: and, whatever he may think, the Wesleyans in general have too much common sense to hazard the immense property vested in their chapels, for the mere purpose of trying some democratic experiment, *very kindly* proposed by John Campbell, D.D., of the Tabernacle House, London. Shame upon us, indeed, if we do not properly appreciate such *pure* and *disinterested* kindness! The "good" Doctor is not the first man who has lifted up his voice for foolish purposes. Some thousand years ago there were men who called from "morning even until noon," but the record says, "there was no voice, nor any that answered."

But perhaps the most annoying of all the freaks of the "good" Doctor is, his appeal to the venerable Dr. Bunting, to come forward and emancipate the Wesleyan Methodists; and promises the Doctor, in case of his compliance, that some complimentary sentence shall be inscribed upon his tombstone. The adulatory language employed by Dr. Campbell, to that excellent and useful individual, is offensive and insulting, and would not fail to be spurned by the gentleman himself with indignation and contempt! The Editor of the "Official Organ" says, "Would that Dr. Bunting, the justly acknowledged Peel of his party, could be induced to walk in the footsteps of that great statesman! Let him close his imperial career by one great act, which shall atone for the errors of a long life, but too successfully devoted to the interests of an *oligarchical despotism*. Let him, by an exercise of his eminent talents, and his all-pervading influence, emancipate the Methodist people from their grievous bondage, and thus endear to them his name through all generations! That observant and experienced man is too sagacious not to see that this emancipation *must come*! If the people's rights be obstinately refused, they will be forceably recovered. His be the distinction, the glory, the bliss, of anticipating the demand which will at length be made in the voice of thunder, and of conducting the goodly vessel of Methodism into a peaceful haven of rational and scriptural freedom! Enough,—more than enough, for posthumous renown, if on his tomb shall be inscribed, 'Here lies the Liberator of the Methodists.'" How the venerable Dr. Bunting relished the fraternal hug of the Northern Doctor, we have not heard!

What Dr. Campbell, in his sagacity and republican notions, calls *emancipation*, the Wesleyans in general would regard as the infliction of a grievous calamity; while his audacity and impudence are without a parallel in the annals of this shameless age. Can Dr. Campbell for one moment imagine, that, after the important services which, for nearly half a century, Dr. Bunting has rendered to the Wesleyan body, that venerable man would, at the suggestion of Dr. Campbell, Editor of the *so-called* "Christian Witness," attempt to prevail upon the Methodists to violate their several trusts, in the manner in which Dr. Campbell declares he violates the Deed of the chapels erected by the venerated and useful Whitefield; or, does not the extreme ridiculousness of Dr. Campbell's proposition appear, even to himself, when he talks of emancipating a people from a system of ecclesiastical order, in which they *voluntarily* acquiesced, which above all others they conscientiously prefer, and in the benefits of which they gratefully participate? Here again we are led to think that the call of Dr. Campbell will be equally fruitless as that of the Prophets of Baal.

One word with regard to the diversified character of Dr. Campbell's



correspondents. An old English proverb states, that a man is known by the company he keeps; so, by a parity of reason, an Editor is known by the character of the correspondents whose communications he invites. In a community so extended as that of the Wesleyan body, it will not be any subject of surprise, that occasionally men of superficial piety are found therein; that others, who deem themselves qualified to hold office, have been disappointed because they have not been placed in some official station, and consequently have been disposed to murmur against the order and the authorities of the church. Some of the "good" Doctor's correspondents are men of this class, whose character and communications we know: others do not even belong to the Wesleyan body, though aiding our *meddling* and *pugnacious* Editor of the "Witness" in his gratuitous efforts for its reformation: others, for acts of positive immorality, have been expelled from the Wesleyan community, as altogether unworthy of its name and fellowship: yet, to the splenetic productions of men of this class, the pages of the so-called "Christian Witness" are open. These are the *worthy* co-adjutors of John Campbell, D.D., in his *quixotic* endeavours to emancipate the Wesleyans from their voluntary bondage! In a future paper, which we intend ere long to publish, to be entitled, "A false Witness *still* further unmasked," we shall, in all probability, after having finished with the "good" Doctor, do a little business in the *unmasking* department with some of his men, commencing with the *amiable*, *pure*, and *immaculate* Robert Garner! More of this anon.

In conclusion, we will adopt the language of an excellent address to Dr. Campbell, which appeared in a provincial paper, and is highly deserving of extensive, nay, universal circulation:—"We know that our Ministers are *men*, and as such we judge of them: your attacks upon them make us love them more, because we can contrast their spirit with yours. By them is the Gospel of reconciliation preached,—sometimes, perhaps, in weakness and in ignorance,—but nevertheless, the Gospel is preached, and with the demonstration of the Spirit. We have not a single chapel perverted by heretical or Socinian teaching; a result which we attribute, under God, TO THE EXCELLENCY OF OUR CHURCH-GOVERNMENT. We do not deem our system *perfect*, or incapable of improvement; but the spirit of our Reformers must be very different from yours; and we greatly wonder at your presumption in setting yourself up as our instructor. We understand the principles of liberty quite as well as you do; and we hope never to violate the spirit of Christianity after your example. We love *union*; and you seek to promote *discord*! You opposed the Evangelical Alliance, and with reason, as your craft is thereby endangered; for if Christians learn to love one another more, there will be few who find pleasure in reading the writings of him who scatters firebrands, arrows, and death. You have succeeded admirably already: one congregation, having imbibed your loving spirit, has refused to announce our (Missionary) Anniversary sermons from the pulpit, because we advocated the rights of the poor to education. Local papers, too, have admitted your attacks upon us, and refused to insert a temperate reply; and although you advertise yourself on the cover of your Magazine, in large letters, as '*a most able, zealous, affectionate, excellent, and useful Pastor*,' we wish for none of your counsels, as we like none of your ways. We say to you, 'Physician, heal thyself.' We are one body, and closely united; and when one member suffers, all suffer alike; when one is offended, we all burn with indignation. Your attempt to *set us against our Preachers* will recoil on your own pate."

For the present we have accomplished our task. We now inquire, what do our readers think of the Reverend Editor of "the Official Organ?" What does the Church think of him? What does the world think? Nay, what does he think of himself? Our opinion is, that he has shaken hands with shame, and parted!

JOHN S. STAMP.

41, Westmoreland-Place, City-Road,  
London.

LONDON:

R. NEEDHAM, PRINTER, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

1901  
1100  
1132  
11

LONDON:

R. NEEDHAM, PRINTER, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

special  
colleo..

BW339  
.V4